



(032590-000039)

**Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary**Application No.: 09/215,630 First Named Applicant: Jane Jiaying JinExaminer: Phuc H. Tran Art Unit: 2666 Status of Application: PendingParticipants: (1) Masako Ando (2) \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 1/6/05 Time: \_\_\_\_\_ (AM/PM)**Type of Interview:**(a) ☒ Telephonic(b) ☐ Personal(c) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: Applicant's response to the Final Office Action filed 11/29/04

**Issues Discussed**

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Objection	1-4, 19-22, 24-26, 28-34 and 42-44	_____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached☐ Copy of Draft Amendment (attached)

**Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:** The claim amendment in the Applicants' response to the Final Office Action was discussed. Applicants believed that the amendment neither raised a new issue nor required a new search since the Examiner had already considered the limitations at issue and found an allowable subject matter therein. However, the Examiner contended that a combination of the allowable subject matter into an independent claim would raise a new issue or require a new search, unless it was by rewriting a dependent claim into independent form. In the discussion, the Examiner suggested that Applicants submit another amendment to cancel the claims which were objected to, and also file a Notice of Appeal to secure time to allow further response, if necessary.

**Note:** The MPEP, section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the Examiner was reached at the interview.

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an Examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the Applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

  
(Applicant/Attorney's Representative Signature)



**BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT AND DISCIPLINE  
UNITED STATE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**LIMITED RECOGNITION UNDER 37 CFR § 10.9(b)**

Masako Ando is hereby given limited recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b) as an employee of Thelen, Reid & Priest LLP to prepare and prosecute patent applications wherein the patent applicant is the client of Thelen, Reid & Priest LLP, and the attorney or agent of record in the applications is a registered practitioner who is a member of Thelen, Reid & Priest LLP. This limited recognition shall expire on the date appearing below, or when whichever of the following events first occurs prior to the date appearing below: (i) Masako Ando ceases to lawfully reside in the United States, (ii) Masako Ando's employment with Thelen, Reid & Priest LLP ceases or is terminated, or (iii) Masako Ando ceases to remain or reside in the United States on an H-1 visa.

This document constitutes proof of such recognition. The original of this document is on file in the Office of Enrollment and Discipline of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

**Expires: August 10, 2006**

Harry I. Moatz

Director of Enrollment and Discipline